

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
**152761-294**

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
**PCT/JP2005/002062**

International filing date (day/month/year)  
**10.02.2005**

Priority date (day/month/year)  
**26.02.2004**

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

**DAI NIPPON PRINTING CO., LTD.**

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- |                                     |              |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I    | Basis of the opinion   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. II   | Priority   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. III  | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. IV   | Lack of unity of invention   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V    | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VI   | Certain documents cited  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Box No. VII  | Certain defects in the international application   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application  |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002062

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language  
\_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002062

**Box No. V** Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-7</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>1-7</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-7</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

**2. Citations and explanations:**

Document 1: JP 10-268428 A (Toppan Printing Co., Ltd.), 09 October 1998, claim 1, Par. Nos. 0014, 0018, 0030, table 1

Document 2: JP 2003-131326 A (Toppan Printing Co., Ltd.), 09 May 2003, claim 1, Par. Nos. 0009, 0019-0020

Document 3: JP 2004-045588 A (Toppan Printing Co., Ltd.), 12 February 2004, Par. No. 0039

None of the documents cited in the ISR describes a light diffusible screen for a transmission projection screen in which "a light diffusion layer has a multilayer structure such that the outermost layer on the light output side of the light diffusion layer is a layer in which the diffusion of light is most intensive, and the surface layer on the light output side of the light diffusible screen has a surface roughness Ra such that  $0.2 \mu\text{m} \leq \text{Ra} \leq 1.0 \mu\text{m}$ , and such screen is not obvious to a person skilled in the art.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/002062

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claim 1

Par. No. 0014 of document 1 cited in the ISR describes a light diffusion layer for a projection screen in which light diffusible fine particles include light diffusible fine particles (A) with a mean particle diameter  $dA \mu\text{m}$  and light diffusible fine particles (B) with a mean particles size  $dB \mu\text{m}$  that satisfy the following conditions:

$$0.5 \mu\text{m} \leq dA \mu\text{m} \leq 7.5 \mu\text{m} \quad (1)$$

$$2.0 \mu\text{m} \leq dB \mu\text{m} \leq 12.0 \mu\text{m} \quad (2)$$

The surface roughness  $Ra$  of this light diffusion layer can satisfy the condition  $0.2 \mu\text{m} \leq Ra \leq 1.0 \mu\text{m}$  as in claim 1.

Document 2 cited in the ISR describes a transmission screen comprising a first diffusion sheet in which a substrate with a thickness of  $500\text{-}1000 \mu\text{m}$  comprises  $5\text{-}20 \text{ wt.}\%$  light diffusion agent consisting of organic fine particles with a mean particle size of  $5\text{-}15 \mu\text{m}$  and a second diffusion sheet in which a substrate with a thickness of  $50\text{-}500 \mu\text{m}$  comprises  $1\text{-}10 \text{ wt.}\%$  light diffusion agent consisting of inorganic fine particles with a mean particle size of  $2\text{-}10 \mu\text{m}$ . In this transmission screen, the outermost layer on the light output side of the light diffusion layer is a layer in which the diffusion of light is most intensive, as described in claim 1.

Claim 2

Document 1 describes that "the difference in refractive index between a light transmissible resin 5 and light diffusible fine particles is generally preferred to be 0.02 or more".

Claims 5, 6

Document 3 cited in the ISR describes that "an antistatic treatment generally includes a method of adding an antistatic agent such as a surfactant to the pre-coated hard coat".